UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

| LE'DON GAITHER, |) CASE NO. 1:06 CV 1910 |
|-----------------|-------------------------|
| Petitioner, |) JUDGE DAVID A. KATZ |
| v. |) OPINION AND ORDER |
| DAVID BOBBY, |) OPINION AND ORDER) |
| Respondent. |) |

On August 10, 2006, petitioner <u>pro se</u> Le'Don Gaither filed the above-captioned habeas corpus action under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Gaither is incarcerated in an Ohio penal institution, having been convicted of aggravated robbery with a firearm specification in 2004. The petition asserts that his conviction is against the manifest weight of the evidence, and that the trial court abused its discretion in sentencing him to more time than the "principal offender" received. <u>See also</u>, <u>State v. Gaither</u>, No. 85023, 2005 WL 1245637 (Cuy. Cty. App. May 26, 2005). For the reasons stated below, the petition is denied and this action is dismissed.

A federal district court may entertain a petition for a writ of habeas corpus by a person in state custody only on the ground that the custody violates the Constitution or laws of the

Case: 1:06-cv-01910-DAK Doc #: 3 Filed: 09/28/06 2 of 2. PageID #: 37

United States. Furthermore, the petitioner must have exhausted all

available state remedies. 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

The issue of whether or not Gaither's convictions were

against the manifest weight of the evidence is an issue of state

law. <u>Cf.</u> <u>Tibbs v. Florida</u>, 457 U.S. 31 (1982) (state appellate

court reversal on weight of the evidence does not preclude retrial

based on the prohibition against double jeopardy). Similarly, no

constitutionally based claim is implicated by his assertion that

his sentence was an abuse of discretion. There is thus no

cognizable habeas claim set forth, as it is simply not the province

of this court to reexamine state-court determinations on state-law

questions. <u>Estelle v. McGuire</u>, 502 U.S. 62, 67-68 (1991).

Accordingly, the petition is denied and this action is

dismissed pursuant to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254

Cases. Further, the court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §

1915(a)(3), that an appeal from this decision could not be taken in

good faith.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ David A. Katz

DAVID A. KATZ

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

2